

Reconsideration of the Application in view of the above amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 5 and 10 were cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein.

Claims 2 and 7 were previously canceled.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 are pending in the application.

Status of Application

The Examiner has rejected the Abstract and the Abstract of the Disclosure is amended to avoid the objection raised by the Examiner.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

The rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite is traversed. The Examiner asserts that the words “permitting” and “permission” in the claims are indefinite.

The last paragraph of claim 1 is substantially similar to the description on page 7, lines 13-15 of the application where the term execution permitting unit is the name of hardware; and the phrase execution permission for a process refers to giving operation permission to the server device to communicate to the terminal device (underscoring added for emphases).

Thus, the first underscored group of words is the name of hardware and the second group of underscored words refers to either allowing or denying the process to be executed.

Clearly, the presence of the words “permitting” and “permission” in claim 1 is not indefinite.

CONCLUSION

13